APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,567	02/27/2002	Yanchun Zhao	CA920010020US1	7960

45541   7590   04/08/2008
HOFFMAN WARNICK & DALESSANDRO LLC
75 STATE ST
14TH FLOOR
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
PATEL, NIRAV B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/084,567	ZHAO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NIRAV PATEL	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _31 October 2007(RCE)_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4-6,8-15,18-22 and 24_ is/are pending in the application.
　 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4-6,8-15,18-22 and 24_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　 a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
　　 1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　 2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　 3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　 application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _10/22/07_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on Oct. 31, 2007 has been entered. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-22, 24 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 13 are amended by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 13-15, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 13 recites, "Security control apparatus for controlling the security of a network server from unauthorized content contained in a message received from a user of said server, the apparatus comprising: means for intercepting said message….; means for examining said message….; means for receiving….; a means for retrieving….; means for examining…..; means for determining…..; means for preventing said…..; means for allowing……". The claimed apparatus direct to software programs/routines [Absence of an explicit and deliberate definition in the specification that the routines must be implemented in hardware or a combination of hardware/software, specification page 3 paragraph 013, 0025] which do not show the physical transformation. Therefore, the claimed "apparatus" would amount to computer programs, a type of functional descriptive material, per se. As such, the claimed apparatus must include the hardware necessary to realize any of the functionality of the claimed routines and produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. Absent recitation of such hardware as part of the claimed apparatus, it is considered non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the
> subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill
> in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-22, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Reshef et al (US Patent No. 6,584,569) in view of Steele et al (US Pub. No. 2003/0191737) and

in view of Wagner (US Patent No. 6,085,224).

As per claim 1, Reshef teaches:

examining the messages that flow between a client browser and a server hosting the web application,

intercepting said message before any content of said message is processed by said server [Fig. 2A,

2C, col. 5 lines 1-4]; examining said message to determine if it contains one or more unauthorized

elements [Fig. 2A, 2C, col. 7 lines 18-67, col. 8 lines 1-12, col. 9 lines 32-51], the examining

comprising: receiving an identification of an execution program set to be used to process said

message received [col. 9 lines 60-67, col. 10 table 1]; retrieving an identification of all message types

associated with said execution program set; examining said message received by said server in

relation to said message types associated with said execution program set [col. 10 table 1, lines 26-

61, col. 9 lines 32-58].

Reshef teaches intercepting the message (HTTP request/response, which includes an entirety of a string of text based information) before any content of the message is processed by said server [Fig. 2A, col. 5 lines 1-4, Fig. 4, 5] and examining/analyzing the message to detect the unauthorized elements [Fig. 2A, 2C, col. 6 lines 26-67, col. 7 lines 51-67, col. 8 lines 1-34].

Steele teaches: the message (HTTP request/response) includes information entered for constructing a query to access data of the server that includes an entirety of a string of text based information entered by a user into a web page provided by the server directly incorporated therein [Fig. 9A-9C, 10].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Steels with Reshef to realize that the message (HTTP request/response) includes the information entered by the user into the web page, since one would have been motivated to detect security vulnerabilities in a web application [Reshef, col. 2 lines 18-20, 32-34, 44-46].

Wagner teaches:

determining if said message received by said server contains an unauthorized element in relation to the corresponding message type for said message received; if it is determined that said message contains an unauthorized element preventing said message received from being processed by said server; if it is determined that said message does not contain an unauthorized element allowing said message received to be processed by said server [Fig. 1, col. 7 lines 44, col. 15 lines 42-67, col. 16 lines 1-42].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wagner with Reshef and Steels, since one would have been motivated to prevent the execution of interpretive language programs or commands [Wagner, col. 3 lines 45-46].

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Wagner teaches if it is determined that said message received contains an unauthorized element, preventing said message received from being processed by said server, and causing an error notification to be sent to said user [col. 4 lines 62-67, col. 16 lines 34-47].

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 2 above.

As per claim 5, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 2 above.

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 2 above.

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and further Wagner teaches:

if it is determined that said message received does not contain an unauthorized element, allowing said message received to be processed by said serve [Fig. 1, 5, 6].

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Wagner teaches the message comprising a name value pair [col. 15 lines 51-62, Fig. 3].

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Wagner teaches said element comprises one or more of the following items: an instruction, a command, a character, a parameter, a token, or a string of any of said previous items [col. 15 lines 51-62, Fig. 3].

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further Wagner teaches:

said element is interpretable as an instruction or command by said server [col. 15 lines 51-62, Fig. 3].

As per claim 13, it is an apparatus claim corresponds to a method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated and Reshef teaches:

network server comprises an Internet network server and said message is received over the Internet by said server from a user [Fig. 2C].

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 2 above.

As per claims 18 and 19, the rejection of claims 13 and 18 are incorporated and are rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claims 10 and 11 above.

As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 12 above.

As per claim 21, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Reshef teaches:

the message types are chosen from the group consisting of: single token; *string;* multiple tokens without keywords: OR, UNION and SEMI-COLON; multiple tokens without keywords: UNION and

SEMI-COLON; multiple tokens without keywords: SEMI-COLON; and multiple tokens without restriction [col. 9 lines 40-45, col. 10 table 1].

As per claim 22, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 21 above.

As per claim 24, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Steele teaches the query is a database query that includes an entirety of the information entered by the user into a field of the web page [Fig. 9A-9C, 10].

Response to Amendment

4. This written action is responding to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) dated Oct. 31, 2007. Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 13, which necessitated new ground of rejection. A new reference by Steele et al is found and used in combination with various previously cited prior art. Steele teaches the message (HTTP request/response) includes information entered for constructing a query to access data of the server that includes an entirety of a string of text based information entered by a user into a web page provided by the server directly incorporated therein [Fig. 9A-9C, 10]. Further, Reshef teaches intercepting the message (HTTP request/response, which includes an entirety of a string of text based information) before any content of the message is processed by said server [Fig. 2A, col. 5 lines 1-4, Fig. 4, 5, Fig. 2A, 2C, col. 6 lines 26-67, col. 7 lines 51-67, col. 8 lines 1-34]. Therefore, the combination of Reshef, Steele and Wagner teaches the claim limitation. See new grounds of rejection above.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Shannon (US 6233618) --- Access control of networked data

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NIRAV PATEL whose telephone number is (571)272-5936. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NBP
4/4/08
/KIMYEN VU/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135